

### **V. REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031658) in view of Satoh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,811,273). Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki, Satoh and further in view of Weiss (U.S. Patent No. 6,623,006). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki, Satoh and further in view of Niwa (U.S. Patent No. 6,790,140). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the previous Office Action, the Examiner raised §103 rejection of claim 1 based on the combination of the following three configurations:

Fig. 2 of Ozaki (US'658): EL panel + opening on the intermediate panel 27

Fig. 28 of Ozaki: LCD panel + semi-transparent reflective plate 25

Satoh (US '273): opening on the transparent frame member 10

In summary, Applicant had argued the Examiner's rejection as follows in the previous response:

It is respectfully submitted that a skilled person would NOT be motivated to provide an opening on the semi-transparent reflective plate 25 of the second configuration (with LCD panel). Accordingly, a skilled person would NOT be motivated to combine the second configuration with the first or the third configuration.

And yet, the Examiner maintains his §103 rejection by mentioning that Satoh discloses the transparent frame member 10 being formed with an opening. It is respectfully submitted that it appears the Examiner is unduly oversimplifying Applicant's previous

arguments and has apparently not examined the Applicant's previous arguments to a reasonable extent.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and Remarks set forth herein above and in the previously-filed Amendment.

*For convenience of the Examiner, Applicant hereby reiterates the Remarks set forth in the previously-filed Amendment under 37 CFR 1.111 filed on August 20, 2007:*

The Office Action admits that Ozaki (US'658) fails to disclose any cutouts or recess formed in the light guiding plate in the configuration shown in Fig. 28, which is an embodiment using an LCD panel, while pointing out that the cutouts are disclosed in the configuration shown in Fig. 2 of Ozaki, which is another embodiment using an EL panel.

It is clearly described in Ozaki that the intermediate panel 27 shown in Fig. 2 is opaque (c.f. paragraph [0045]). The cutouts are formed on the intermediate panel 27 so that the reels 30 could be seen through the opaque intermediate panel 27 and through the transparent EL panel 28.

It should be noted here that an EL panel is a spontaneous luminescent type device that does not require backlight in displaying an image.

In the alternative embodiment shown in Fig. 28, the semi-transparent reflective plate 25 is disposed to provide a backlight to the LCD panel 24. A skilled person would not be motivated to form a cutout, like the one formed on the opaque intermediate panel 27, on the semi-transparent reflective plate 25 that is already semi-transparent as shown by the arrows in Fig. 28.

A skilled person would also not be motivated to do so by a reason that, if a cutout is formed on the plate 25, the backlight would not be provided to the LCD panel at the cutout when the back side display device 2 is made dark as described in paragraph [0139], causing the image displayed by the LCD panel damaged.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a skilled person would not be motivated to form a cutout on the plate 25 as such disclosed in a different embodiment of Ozaki or in Satoh (US 273). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention would not be obvious from the combination of Ozaki and Satoh.

At least for the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Newly-added claim 10 also includes features not shown in the applied art. In brief, the new independent claim 10 recites all the subject matter recited in claim 4 and the feature "the light guiding plate illuminates the reels with light scattered out from the cutout or the recess".

Satoh discloses a configuration to guide light emitted from the cutout face of the transparent frame member 10 toward a direction opposite to the reels. Satoh fails to suggest illuminating the reels with light emitted from the cutout.

Weiss (US 006) discloses a configuration, if not explicitly, in which the peripheral faces of the LCD 20 are covered by a frame.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance; the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the


SHO-0051  
(80033-0051)

Application No.: 10/697,084

Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Date: December 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Carl Schaukowitch  
Reg. No. 29,211  
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W. Suite 501  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 955-3750  
Fax: (202) 955-3751  
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal